

She must take the child's wish to make good, to create, as a factor in the development of his real skill and achievement.

She must make use of it in the real world, and show him how to be effective with it in the real world. She has no direct concern in her work as an educator with the fact that the child's love and wish to make may be covering his fear and hate and wish to destroy. That is the analyst's concern, not the teacher's.

Where the child does *not* show a wish to learn, to make good, to be friendly in the real world, but only knows how to be defiant and to destroy and to hate, then, of course, it is the business of the teacher to understand that he needs special psychological help; that is to say, when she has exhausted those general methods of patient encouragement and trust and teaching which will help most children out of their difficult moments, it becomes her business to understand the child's need of analysis. But the unconscious wishes as such are not, and cannot be within her competence—any more than the teaching and training of the child in skilful manipulation or understanding of the *external* world is within the competence of the analyst.

The educator, of course, makes use of the child's unconscious impulses, whether these be impulses of love or hate, of creation or destruction, since the child's unconscious wishes underlie every aspect of his conscious behaviour, and are its ultimate source. But the educator can only make use of unconscious trends in so far as they are available within the field of the conscious life, and in the form in which they are available in conscious life. She does not need to know that the child's interest in engines is ultimately linked with his phantasies of parental intercourse ; she does not

ne'ed to know
 that the child's high tower of bricks represents,
 among many
 other things, his own or his father's phallus. If
 she be a
 psychologist as well as an educator, and
 interested in these
 things for their own sake, then there is no
 reason why she
 should not know ; but *qua educator*, she has no
 concern with
 the deep symbolism of the child's everyday
 activities. What
 she needs is to understand the normal
 conscious movement
 of the child's mind, as expressed in interests
 and activities
 and conscious pleasures or fears.

(3) The third chief difference between the
 function of
 the educator and that of the analyst is that
 whereas the